

and the card I had received are attached to this declaration as Attachment Q.

30. As of the date of this declaration, I have not received any written response to my demand for a full refund for my payments to Micom for its license application services. The Federal Trade Commission provided me with a copy of a letter, a true and correct copy of which is attached to this declaration as Attachment R. I never received a copy of Attachment R or any facsimile thereof.

31. In sum, I paid Micom \$21,000 for services related to the preparation of ten (10) FCC license applications. The man who identified himself as Mr. Viggiano told me that Micom applied for only three of six 931 MHz license applications, but I have never received the licenses or copies of the applications. Mr. Viggiano also has been unable to confirm the filing of any of the other applications, even though Mr. Carlson told me that the Micom had already filed such applications, particularly for the Minnesota regional deal that purportedly obligated me to make installment payments for applications because Micom supposedly could not pull those applications back from the FCC. As of the date of this declaration, I have only received one FCC license application through Micom for a city that I requested, though I never expected, and Micom never told me, that it might be for a shared frequency.

32. I paid Micom \$21,000 for FCC license application services based on Micom's representations that such license applications would enhance my FCC license "portfolio" so that I would be able to lease all my FCC licenses. I paid Micom for license application services because they told me that leases on FCC licenses would provide me a monthly income. As a retired court reporter, I was concerned about relying on Social Security benefits and my other assets for retirement income. I had to borrow money to pay for some of those license applications and used my cash savings for the rest. As noted in paragraph nine of this declaration, I specifically told Mr. Carlson that I was no longer liquid and could not afford additional payments for additional FCC licenses but Mr. Carlson assured me that Micom's deals, which I was entitled to because of my prior investments with Micom, would provide me income to cover additional payments. Mr. Carlson told me that I would be receiving monthly income of more than \$9000 for some of the deals he was negotiating. He told me repeatedly that the FCC licensing program was designed to prevent large companies from directly obtaining licenses from the FCC so that small investors could hold those licenses and participate in the telecommunications industry. He told me that paging companies would thus need to lease licenses from me, and I understood there to be little risk that I would not obtain leases for my licenses.

33. No representative of Micom has ever told me, and I never anticipated, that I would be required to spend more money to

construct telecommunication systems for the licenses to keep them operational. No representative of Micom has ever told me that there was a risk that I would not recover my investment. If I had understood that I might lose the money I spent on FCC license applications, I never would have paid Micom that money. I have lost my savings, as well as investment opportunities for those savings, and am liable for interest on some of the money I paid Micom. The \$21,000 refund that I have repeatedly requested from Mr. Viggiano and Micom is not a full measure of the losses I have incurred through investments with Micom.

34. Having been unable to obtain a refund on my own, I have tried to retain an attorney to obtain a full refund on my behalf. I have hired Jack Halperin to represent me, and Mr. Halperin has provided me a copy of a letter that he has indicated that he sent to Micom for a refund. A true and correct copy of the letter is attached to this declaration as Attachment S.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED: March 14, 1996 _____

EXHIBIT 17
23

DECLARATION OF MR.

pursuant to U.S.C. § 1746, declares as follows:

1. My name is _____ I am a citizen of the United States, over eighteen (18) years of age, and have personal knowledge of the matters contained in this declaration. My residential address is _____

2. Prior to March of 1995, I was deciding how to invest my retirement savings. I decided, along with several friends, former co-workers, and others, to invest in the development of a paging, telecommunications company operated by and for Spanish-speaking people. I decided that I did not have sufficient funds to contribute to the development of communications systems, so I agreed with my potential partners that I would pay for the preparation of license applications to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to obtain the paging licenses. From March 1995 through November 1995, I sent tens of thousands of dollars to Micom Corporation for Micom to apply to the FCC on my behalf for exclusive 929 MHz paging licenses in several cities. True and correct copies of the checks I sent to Micom (at 421 7th Avenue, New York, New York 10001) are attached to this declaration as Attachment A.

EXHIBIT 19
1

3. My payment of Micom for FCC license application services came about primarily through telephone conversations with a man who identified himself as Steve Carlson, a partner of Joseph Viggiano of Micom. I told Mr Carlson repeatedly that I wanted exclusive 929 MHz licenses and not shared paging licenses. Mr. Carlson told me repeatedly that the licenses I wanted were available. I also told Mr. Carlson that I wanted exclusive paging licenses for the development of a paging business. I also wrote on my checks, as shown in the copies on Attachment A, that I wanted exclusive licenses. Mr. Carlson told me that, if I was unable to develop systems for my licenses, he would market my licenses to paging companies for me, and that he already had agreements for such purposes with companies in California, Arizona and Texas. Mr. Carlson told me that paging companies would lease the licenses from me for several thousand dollars per month.

4. I have received only six shared licenses from my payment of Micom for 929 MHz licenses. I have not received many of the licenses I paid Micom to prepare applications for. My potential partners in building a paging system told me that they cannot currently develop a paging system with my licenses because the licenses are shared.

5. To date, I have not been able to obtain any lease or sale of the 929 MHz licenses that I obtained through Micom Corporation. I do not have the financial resources to build communications

systems for those licenses. I also have multiple sclerosis and glaucoma. I cannot develop communications systems for my licenses.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED: March 14/96 / _____

DECLARATION OF MR.

Mr. _____ pursuant to U.S.C. § 1746, declares as follows:

1. My name is _____ I am a resident alien of the United States, over (18) eighteen years of age, and have personal knowledge of the matters contained in this declaration. My residential address is _____

2. In November and December 1995, I received telephone calls from a man who identified himself as Paul Aronowitz, a representative of Micom Corporation. Mr. Aronowitz told me that Micom charged consumers several thousand dollars to apply for paging licenses. True and correct copies of a letter that I received from Mr. Aronowitz and projections that Mr. Aronowitz said were the type of revenue that I could earn are attached to this declaration as Attachment A. Mr. Aronowitz and I discussed the fact that I had already applied for 929 MHz licenses in three areas --- Miami, Florida, Phoenix, Arizona and St. Louis, Missouri. Mr. Aronowitz told me that I should acquire more licenses near my Miami license so that I could market those licenses together to paging companies. Mr. Aronowitz told me that I would be more likely to lease my license to paging companies if I acquired more than one.

3. Mr. Aronowitz made several aggressive sales presentations to me telephonically. Mr. Aronowitz called me on several occasions and told me that I should acquire more licenses. Mr. Aronowitz repeatedly told me that I would make back the money that I spent on

my license applications by leasing my licenses to paging companies. He did not tell me that there was any risk that I would lose my money. I felt like he was pushing me to buy more licenses. Mr. Aronowitz told me I should wire money to Micom before I missed out on the opportunity to obtain licenses. He insisted on picking up my packages by Federal Express. Mr. Aronowitz continued to tell me that my investment in licenses would be profitable to me. Based on my conversations with Mr. Aronowitz, I agreed to pay Micom \$6000 to apply for 929 MHz licenses in the Tampa, Florida area on my behalf. True and correct copies of documentation of my second payment to Micom are attached to this declaration as Attachment B.

4. At no time prior to or since my payment to Micom for its services did Mr. Aronowitz or any Micom representative tell me, either through a telephonic sales presentation or in writing, that I would be required personally to construct or finance the construction of a communications system for my paging licenses. Instead, Mr. Aronowitz told me that I would satisfy any construction requirement by leasing my licenses to paging companies that would build out my licenses for me. I did not believe at the time that I paid Micom for services that I would have to construct telecommunications systems to avoid losing my licenses.

5. In January, 1996, I became concerned that I had not received any notification of filings for FCC licenses on my behalf. I contacted the Personal Communications Industry Association and was told by a PCIA representative that they had received no applications on my behalf. I filed complaints with the New York

Attorney General's office and the Better Business Bureau of New York. True and correct copies of those applications are attached to this declaration as Attachment C.

6. At no time prior to or since my payment of Micom for its services did Mr. Aronowitz or any Micom representative tell me, either through a telephonic sales presentation or in writing, that federal regulations prohibit the acquisition of licenses for the primary purpose of speculation or profitable resale. I did not tell Mr. Aronowitz or any representative of Micom at any time that I intended to provide paging services directly to the public or personally construct communications systems for my paging licenses. I only paid Micom for license applications because I understood, from my conversations with Mr. Aronowitz, that applying for such licenses would enable me to lease them with the licenses I previously acquired, such that I would make a return on my investments. I applied for paging licenses through Micom for investment purposes. I would not have applied for paging licenses by using Micom's services if I had known that there was a substantial risk that I might not make a return on my investment.

7. As of the date of this declaration, I have received no 929 MHz paging license for my payment of Micom for services.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED: 3-13-94

DECLARATION OF
Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746

1. My name is _____ I am a United States
citizen over eighteen (18) years of age. I reside in _____

I have personal knowledge of the facts set
forth below.

2. In or about late May or early June 1995, I saw an
advertisement on television pertaining to investment
opportunities in Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") paging
licenses. That advertisement provided a toll-free 800 telephone
number which I immediately called. The representative who
answered the telephone, and whose name I do not remember, asked
me for my name, address and telephone number, which I provided.

3. Soon thereafter, a man identifying himself as Mark
Williams called me and told me he was a salesperson for North
East Telecommunications. ("NET"). Mr. Williams told me that NET
provides application filing services for individuals interested
in obtaining FCC paging licenses.

4. Mr. Williams told me that NET was located at 1 World
Trade Center, Suite 7967, New York, New York. He gave me a toll-
free 800 number, 800-771-3575, for me to use when calling NET.
On several occasions, I dialed 800-771-3575 and reached a
receptionist at that telephone number who transferred my calls to
Mr. Williams.

5. Mr. Williams told me that NET charges a minimum of \$8,500.00 to apply for 929 MHz shared paging licenses on behalf of consumers and that NET will complete all the necessary work required to file the FCC application. He stated that unless an applicant provides engineering studies with the paging license application, the FCC would reject the application. Further, he said that NET has its own engineering department and that NET consumers must submit their application and fees by Tuesday of each week so that NET's engineers could complete the necessary work for the applications.

6. Mr. Williams told me that NET's fees are based on how many licenses a customer applies for. He said that NET charges a frequency coordination fee of \$180.00 per application, an FCC filing fee of \$125.00 per application, and an "application completion" fee of \$985.00 per license. He further stated that once I obtain my license(s), NET will arrange for tower site operators to lease my license(s) and that NET's profit is made by arranging these leases for its customers. He stated that for licenses in California, NET would obtain up to 5,000 subscribers per license with each paying a monthly usage fee of \$0.90 to \$1.00. Further, Mr. Williams stated that NET could guarantee that within three months of my receiving the license from the FCC, the lease arrangement would provide me monthly income of \$20,000.00 to \$25,000 00.

7. Mr. Williams stated that these paging licenses are valuable investments and when I asked him how much risk was involved, he said "none."

8. After my telephone conversation with Mr. Williams, I received via Federal Express a brochure and promotional materials from NET. Several weeks later, Mr. Williams sent me another brochure and accompanying promotional materials, identical to the original package, in an attempt to have me convince friends and family members to invest with NET. Attachment A to this declaration is a true and correct photocopy of some of the materials sent to me to give to others.

9. At some point before I invested with NET, I spoke with Mr. Williams and asked him if I could speak with a satisfied client of NET. Mr. Williams transferred me to a man he identified as Steve Collins, of NET's upper management. Mr. Collins gave me the name and telephone number of an existing NET customer, Joe Simon of Miami, Florida, and told me I could telephone Mr. Simon at 305-722-0580. Soon thereafter, I telephoned 305-722-0580 and spoke with a man who identified himself as Joe Simon, a customer of NET. Mr. Simon said that he applied for one license through NET in January 1995 and that by April 1995, he entered into a lease with a paging company and was earning \$5,000.00 per month through that lease.

10. In July 1995, after speaking with Messrs. Williams and Simon and after reading NET's promotional materials, I decided to invest in twelve (12) licenses in San Francisco, California for \$12,430.00, ten (10) licenses in San Diego, California for \$10,460.00, and a twenty-four (24) licenses in Los Angeles, California for \$24,860 00. I sent two (2) personal checks to 1 World Trade Center, Suite 7967, New York, New York using NET's Federal Express account as directed by Mr. Williams. In July 1995, I received two confirmation letters from Kaitlyn Moore of NET acknowledging NET's receipt of my funds. Attachment B to this declaration contains true and correct photocopies of the letters I received. Included in the materials attached to this declaration as Attachment A is a document titled "Application and Services Agreement for Private Carrier Paging License Applications." Mr. Williams had me sign this document and return the signed copy to him when I sent NET my payment for the San Francisco and San Diego licenses.

11. In August 1995, I began receiving postcards from the Personal Communications Industry Association ("PCIA") acknowledging my applications for paging licenses. However, the postcards did not reflect the fact that I had applied for the number of licenses Mr. Williams told me NET would apply for on my behalf (i.e., 46 licenses). After I sent NET my payments, it became very difficult for me to contact Mr. Williams. At some point, the exact time of which I do not recall, someone

affiliated with NET provided me with the name Ron Stewart, another representative of NET. During August 1995, I telephoned 800-771-3575 numerous times and left several messages with the receptionist for both Messrs. Williams and Stewart. Sometime thereafter, I spoke with Mr. Stewart and noticed he spoke with a British accent. He stated that, contrary to what Mr. Williams had told me, NET filed on my behalf applications for two (2) licenses in both San Francisco and San Diego and four (4) licenses in Los Angeles (i.e., eight (8) licenses total). I was very unhappy at being misled regarding the number of licenses I paid NET to apply for.

12. In or about September 1995, I received a telephone call from a man who identified himself as Roger Ford, a marketing representative of NET, and who spoke with a British accent. Mr. Ford apologized for NET's lack of communication with me. I asked him what the status was with my paging licenses. Mr. Ford provided examples of how much income I would receive from the lease agreements for the three licenses. For San Diego, Mr. Ford said, my license initially would have at least 1,800 subscribers, who would each pay \$0.78 per month, yielding me \$1,404.00 in monthly income. Mr. Ford said a San Francisco paging license would have at least 2,800 subscribers, each paying a monthly fee of \$0.92, providing me with \$2,576.00 in monthly income. Finally, Mr. Ford said Los Angeles' initial subscriber base would be 4,000, with each paying a monthly fee of \$1.15, providing me

with \$4,600.00 in monthly income.

13. Further, Mr. Ford told me I could "cash out" of any of these licenses immediately and that NET knew of potential buyers that would pay \$68,000.00 for both the San Diego licenses, \$94,000.00 for both the San Francisco licenses and \$112,000.00 for the four Los Angeles licenses.

14. Mr. Ford encouraged me to apply for additional licenses through NET. He told me that NET has a "linkage program" in Florida whereby if I applied for and received licenses in Miami, Orlando and Tampa, Florida, NET would arrange lease agreements with companies in which the monthly fee per user would be \$1.25 in each city and the monthly income to me would be \$9,375.00 in the first year. He told me that approximately ninety (90) days after NET files for the licenses, I would receive the licenses and that, at that same time, NET's lease agreements would begin to provide me with a monthly income of \$1,020.00 for Tampa, (1,500 subscribers at \$0.68 per user); a monthly income of \$3,000.00 for Miami (3,000 subscribers at \$1.00 per user); and a monthly income of \$3,000.00 for Orlando (3,000 subscribers at \$1.00 per user).

15. Based on Mr. Ford's representations, I decided to join what he described as NET's linkage program by obtaining licenses in Miami, Orlando and Tampa. I paid NET \$12,430.00 for each of

the three locations consisting of two six (6) tower licenses, for a total of \$37,290.00 for all six (6) licenses.

16. Sometime in or about October 1995, I spoke again with Mr. Ford. He told me to call a new 800 toll-free telephone number to reach him: 800-823-1113. He also said that NET gave to its engineering department the original 800 telephone number that I used previously. On at least one occasion, I telephoned 800-823-1113 and reached Mr. Ford directly. Also sometime in October 1995, I asked Mr. Ford whether I would have to construct the licenses NET applied for on my behalf. Mr. Ford stated that the towers were already constructed. I also asked Mr. Ford whether it was true that the FCC required licensees to put the licenses in use within eight (8) months of receiving the license. He reassured me by saying that NET would arrange leases that would put the licenses partially in use so that I would meet the FCC's eight (8) month deadline. I also asked him what the difference was between the shared licenses NET applied for and exclusive licenses. Mr. Ford said he had one exclusive license he could offer me in Las Vegas but that it cost \$975,000.00. I told him I was not interested in that exclusive license, and he stated that I was better off with shared licenses because shared licenses are in higher demand than exclusive licenses.

17. I subscribe to the telephone service known as "Caller ID" that allows me to see the telephone number of the party

calling me. During many of my telephone conversations with Messrs. Williams, Collins, Stewart and Ford, I wrote down the telephone numbers that appeared on the caller ID display. The telephone numbers all had a 305 area code and are as follows: 725-0864; 725-0865; 725-0969; 725-8423; 725-8424; 725-8427; 784-4153; 784-5137; 784-7055; 785-2546; 785-2667; and 785-2758.

18. As of this date, I have received two (2) 929 MHz shared frequency paging licenses for San Diego, two (4) 929 MHz shared frequency paging licenses for Los Angeles, and one (1) 929 MHz shared frequency paging license for San Francisco, Orlando and Tampa. I have not yet received the two licenses I applied for in Miami, the second license I applied for in Orlando and the second license I applied for in San Francisco. Attachment C to this declaration is true and correct photocopies of the FCC licenses I have received.

19. My last contact with Mr. Ford was in or about October 1995 when I telephoned him to inquire as to the status of any leases for my licenses. He made various promises regarding when the lease arrangements would be in place and providing residual monthly income to me. His final promise was that all leases, including the Florida licenses which were not due to be finalized until February or March, would be in place no later than November 24, 1995 and that I would receive residual income by December 1, 1995. Since October 1995, I have made repeated telephone calls

to 800-823-1113 and a representative from an answering service has taken my messages for Mr. Ford. I also have telephoned 800-771-3575 and the (305) telephone numbers listed in paragraph 17 above but they were all disconnected.

20. As of this date, I have received no offers to lease or to purchase my licenses.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on January ____, 1996

Declaration of
Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746

1. My name is . I am a United States citizen over eighteen (18) years of age. I reside in I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth below.

2. Around August 1995, I saw an infomercial on television pertaining to investment opportunities in Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") paging licenses. The infomercial provided a toll free 800 telephone number, 800-517-4848, which I immediately called. The representative who answered the telephone and whose name I do not remember, asked me for my name, address and telephone number which I provided.

3. About one week later, a man identifying himself as Tom Barr called me and told me he was a salesperson for NET. Over the next several weeks I spoke with Mr. Barr on numerous occasions regarding NET. Mr. Barr told me that NET provides filing services for individuals interested in obtaining FCC paging licenses. He stated that the FCC holds auctions for paging licenses once every five years in which only corporations may participate but, for a limited time only, the FCC was allowing individuals to apply for such paging licenses. Moreover, Mr. Barr explained that the FCC grants only one license per region per applicant.

4. After speaking with Mr. Barr for the first time, I received via Federal Express promotional materials from NET. Attachment A to this declaration is a true and correct photocopy of some of the materials sent to me. The handwritten notes on the materials are mine.

5. Mr. Barr told me that NET will complete all the necessary paperwork required to file the FCC application. Mr. Barr stated that NET charges \$1,000 per tower site for each paging license and that the minimum investment per license was nine (9) towers, or \$9,000, and the maximum investment was thirty-six (36) towers, or \$36,000. He said that if I invested, I would be investing in a 929 MHz shared paging license that has existing towers. Mr. Barr stated that a shared paging license is preferable to an exclusive paging license because an exclusive license requires that I build it out myself but a shared license provides existing towers so I do not have to build out the license.

6. Once NET applied for the license on my behalf and I received it, Mr. Barr said that NET would contact large, established paging companies and arrange for one of them to lease my license. Mr. Barr stated companies such as AT&T, PageNet and MCI would seek to lease my license and that NET would broker at least a five (5) year lease.

7. Mr. Barr suggested that I apply for licenses in Tampa, Florida and Houston, Texas. For both licenses, Mr. Barr stated I could have an immediate subscriber base of 1,000 per tower and that each subscriber would pay a monthly usage fee. Thus, Mr. Barr said that if I applied for twelve towers in Tampa, the license would carry 12,000 subscribers each paying \$0.90 per month. Based on those figures, Mr. Barr estimated that the lease NET would arrange for me would then generate \$10,800.00 in monthly income. Similarly, for the Houston license, Mr. Barr stated that there were 1,000 available subscribers per tower and the cost per subscriber per month was \$0.76. Accordingly, if I applied for nine towers and allowed NET to arrange a lease, I would receive \$6,840.00 in monthly income. Finally, Mr. Barr told me I would begin receiving monthly income from these lease agreements by February 1996.

8. If I decided not to lease my license, Mr. Barr told me that I could sell my license to a paging company for a set sum. For instance, Mr. Barr estimated that I would be able to sell a twelve-tower license in Tampa to a paging company for \$65,000.00. He said that a paging company would purchase a nine-tower license in Houston for \$45,000.00.

9. Mr. Barr stated that these paging licenses are valuable, "risk-free" investments, particularly because the paging licenses I would be applying for through NET are already

constructed and operational.

10. Mr. Barr told me that NET was located at 1 World Trade Center, Suite 7967, New York, New York. He gave me a toll free 800 telephone number, 800-771-3575, to use when calling NET. On several occasions, I dialed 800-771-3575 and reached Mr. Barr.

11. After speaking with Mr. Barr and reviewing the materials, I decided to invest \$12,430.00 with NET for a twenty-four-tower 929 MHz shared paging license in Tampa, Florida. I also invested \$947.50 with NET as a down payment for a nine-tower license in Houston, Texas. Mr. Barr told me that I could make this down payment and that even if I decided not to make further payments, NET would apply for and obtain on my behalf a nine-tower license in Houston. Attachment B to this declaration consists of true and correct photocopies of the cashiers checks reflecting my payments to NET.

12. In late September 1995, I received a letter from Kaitlyn Moore of NET in which she confirmed that NET received payment from me in the amount \$13,377.50. Attachment C to this declaration is a true and correct photocopy of the September 1995 letter.

13. Soon after sending in my payment to NET, I received two postcards from the Personal Communications Industry Association

("PCIA") reflecting that it received an application on my behalf for a twelve-tower paging license in Tampa. Because I had applied for a twenty-four tower license, I telephoned the 800 number given to me by Mr. Barr and spoke with him. I told him that I was very unhappy and wanted a refund. Mr. Barr said I should speak with Roger Ford of NET and then a man with a British accent who identified himself to me as Roger Ford got on the telephone. Mr. Ford said that he was the director at NET and tried to reassure me that there were no problems with my investment. Mr. Ford stated that NET has been in business since the 1960s and is an established corporation with offices at 1 World Trade Center in New York City. He told me that NET belongs to various organizations, including PCIA. In late September 1995, I received a letter signed by Mr. Ford in which he identified himself as "Marketing Director." Attachment D to this declaration is a true and correct photocopy of the letter Roger Ford sent me (without the accompanying industry articles).

14. To assure me further, Mr. Ford gave me the name and telephone number of an existing NET customer, Joe Simon of Miami, Florida and told me I could call him at 305-722-0580. I called 305-722-0580 and left messages on the answering machine. Soon thereafter, told me that a man identifying himself as Joe Simon, a customer of NET, had called our house while I was at work. told me that Mr. Simon said that he applied for two licenses through NET, that he obtained the licenses, and that

he has leased the licenses and is receiving income from them.

15. Although I applied for a twenty-four-tower license in Tampa, I received a twelve-tower license from the FCC in late October or early November. Attachment E to this declaration is a true and correct photocopy of the license I received.

16. In late October 1995, I received another letter from Ms. Moore in which she confirmed that NET received payment from me in the amount of \$947.50 as a down payment on the Houston, Texas license. She stated that NET could arrange a payment plan with no interest for six (6) months for the remaining \$8,527.50. Attachment F to this declaration is a true and correct photocopy of the October 1995 letter.

17. On numerous occasions since November 1995, I have attempted to reach Mr. Barr at the 800 telephone number I used previously. At some point in November 1995, I telephoned the 800 number and heard a recording stating that the line had been disconnected. Some time after that, I telephoned the 800 number and a receptionist answered the telephone. I left many messages but the individual answering the telephone has consistently told me that Mr. Barr is in a meeting, and Mr. Barr has never returned my messages.

18. As of this date, I have received no license for Houston, Texas even though Mr. Barr told me that NET would use my down payment to apply for and to obtain on my behalf a nine-tower license.

19. As of this date, I have received no offers either to lease or to buy my license.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on January _____, 1996
